

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/084,555

Applicant(s)

GOGGINS ET AL.

Examiner

Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1637

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D.

(3) _____

(2) Lisa Haile, J.D., Ph.D.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 4/26/2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 7, 8, 10-14, 22 and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner telephoned Dr. Haile to inform her that the claims 7-8, 10-14 and 22-23 as amended are now in condition for allowance. The examiner told Dr. Haile that no prior art was found teaching determining the methylation state of a preproenkephalin gene as a diagnostic tool for detecting pancreatic or colorectal cancer. The examiner told Dr. Haile that no prior art was cited in the previous office action because the closest prior art is made of record on the form 1449.